UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,839	03/31/2004	Hugh B. Svendsen	1104-062	6056
	7590 03/14/200 nnology and Withrow &	EXAMINER		
100 Regency Fo Suite 160	orest Drive	KIM, JUNG W		
Cary, NC 27518	3	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
• *			2132	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		03/14/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/813,83	9	SVENDSEN ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		JUNG KIM		2132				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ddress			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RECHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by streply received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THE R 1.136(a). In no even in the control of the control	IS COMMUNICATION int, however, may a reply be tind the spire SIX (6) MONTHS from the ication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·			
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	17 December 21	007					
-	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.							
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
٠,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	on of Claims							
4)⊠)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-34</u> is/are pending in the application.							
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
′—	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9,15-25 and 31-34</u> is/are rejected.							
·	Claim(s) <u>10-14 and 26-30</u> is/are objected to							
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar		equirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
	The specification is objected to by the Exan	miner						
•	-		objected to by the I	Examiner.				
.0/	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.05(a).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
۵)	 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
			,					
Attachme =	t(e)							
Attachmen 1) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date								
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		5) Notice of Informal F	atent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) L Other:								

Art Unit: 2132

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to the amendment filed on 12/17/07.

2. Claims 1-34 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior art rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. On pg. 10 of the Remarks, Applicant argues that the Sit prior art does not anticipate all limitations of the independent claims because Sit does not disclose "translating the HTTP request into a request packet and sending the request packet to the peer server," but rather "Sit discloses wrapping a request sent from a browser 314E to a web server 308I, which is behind a firewall 305, such that, to the firewall 305, the request appears as a response from the browser 314E to a request sent by the web server 308I." Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because the term "translating the HTTP request into a request packet" under the broadest reasonable interpretation standard does not appear to be limiting in the sense as argued by the applicant. (MPEP 2111.01, "During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow ... This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless the plain meaning is inconsistent with the specification") The term "translating," under the plain meaning of the term, is a step to change into another form. The plain meaning of the term "request packet" is interpreted as any packet including a request by a sender to a destination. (see any

Art Unit: 2132

dictionary) Hence a translation of a HTTP request into a request packet is any modification to a HTTP request into a packet, where the packet is changed into another form, and where the packet includes a request from a sender to a destination.

Moreover, this interpretation is consistent with the enabling portion of the Specification (see paragraph 21). The Sit invention does exactly this procedure. In order to bypass a firewall, a request packet is changed into a different packet by wrapping the request, the wrapped request is transmitted through the firewall, then the header and trailer portions of the packet are removed to reveal the original request packet and forwarded to the destination. (col. 7:50-8:12) Hence, Sit discloses the limitation "translating the HTTP request into a request packet"; for these reasons, applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Claims 1-9, 15-25 and 31-34 remain rejected under the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 4. Claims 1-4 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sit et al. USPN 6,349,336 (hereinafter Sit).
- 5. As per claims 1-4, Sit discloses a method for providing a Web browser running on a computer with HTTP access to a peer server located behind a firewall in a peer-to-peer network (col. 8:14-21), comprising; (a) providing the peer-to-peer network with a proxy server (fig. 5); (b) registering an outbound socket connection with the proxy server by the peer server (5:16-20); (c) in response to the proxy server receiving an HTTP request to access the peer server from the Web browser, translating the HTTP request

Art Unit: 2132

into a request packet and sending the request packet to the peer server (7:50-60); and (d) in response to the peer server receiving the request packet, translating the request packet back into the HTTP request and responding to the request, thereby enabling generic web traffic to flow (7:61-64);

- 6. wherein the peer server further includes a Web server (fig. 5, reference nos. 308E and 308I), step (d) further including the steps of: (i) responding to request by passing the HTTP request to the Web server; (ii) receiving an HTTP response from Web server; (iii) translating HTTP response into a response packet; (iv) sending the response packet from the peer server to the proxy server over the outbound socket connection; (v) receiving the response packet on the proxy server and translating a response packet back into the HTTP response; and (vi) sending the HTTP response from the peer server to the Web browser; (7:64-68)
- 7. wherein the peer-to-peer network includes multiple peer servers, and the proxy server is separate and apart from the peer servers;(fig. 5, reference nos. 306 and 312)
- 8. providing each of the peer servers with a peer node, a Web server, and a Web browser. (fig. 5, reference nos. 308E, 310E, 314E, 308I, 310I and 314I)
- 9. As per claims 17-20, they are claims corresponding to claims 1-4, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 1-4. Therefore, claims 17-20 are rejected as being anticipated by Sit for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 1-4.

Art Unit: 2132

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. Claims 5-7, 15, 16, 21-23 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sit.

11. As per claims 5-7, the rejection of claim 4 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sit is incorporated herein. Sit does not expressly disclose providing the peer-to-peer network with a registration server and a DNS server; passing a name of the peer server from the peer server to the registration server, and receiving a name and IP address of the proxy server to which it is assigned; wherein step (b) further includes the step of: registering by the peer server, the name of the proxy server, and the IP address of the proxy server with the DNS server. However, these steps are conventional means of resolving domain names. DNS registration is the defacto means of mapping hostnames to IP addresses. Further, because a peer server is located behind the proxy server, the peer server needs to register with the DNS with information that it is assigned to the proxy server. Moreover, resolution of domain names requires the name of the proxy server and the IP address of the server. Examiner takes Official Notice of this teaching. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the invention of Sit to further include the following steps: providing the peer-to-peer network with a registration server and a DNS server; passing a name of the peer server from the peer server to the registration server, and receiving a name and IP address of the proxy server to which it is assigned; wherein

Art Unit: 2132

step (b) further includes the step of: registering by the peer server, the name of the proxy server, and the IP address of the proxy server with the DNS server. One would be motivated to do so to enable a user to access a peer server behind a proxy agent using a host name. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 5-7.

Page 6

- 12. As per claims 21-23, they are claims corresponding to claims 5-7, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 5-7. Therefore, claims 21-23 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sit for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 5-7.
- 13. As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 2 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sit is incorporated herein. Although Sit does not expressly disclose step (d) further includes the step of: breaking the HTTP response into chunks and sending the chunks to the proxy server in successive peer response packets, it is notoriously well known in the art that data over a link is transmitted in limited size blocks of data to enable reliable and efficient transmission of the message. Examiner takes Official Notice of this teaching. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for step (d) to further include the step of: breaking the HTTP response into chunks and sending the chunks to the proxy server in successive peer response packets. One would be motivated to do so to transmit messages reliably and efficiently as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 15.

Application/Control Number: 10/813,839

Art Unit: 2132

14. As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sit is incorporated herein. Although Sit does not expressly disclose wherein the step (d) further includes the step of: providing the peer server with several threads for handling HTTP requests from the proxy server, and multiplexing responses to those requests over the same response socket back to the proxy server; conventional servers are typically enabled to handle multiple requests simultaneously to prevent bottlenecks caused by a single request. Furthermore, threading is achieved via multiprocessing. Examiner takes Official Notice of this teaching. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the step of (d) to further include the step of: providing the peer server with several threads for handling HTTP requests from the proxy server, and multiplexing responses to those requests over the same response socket back to the proxy server. One would be motivated to do so to provide an efficient means of handling requests via multiprocessing as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 16.

Page 7

15. As per claims 31 and 32, they are claims corresponding to claims 15 and 16, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 15 and 16.

Therefore, claims 31 and 32 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sit for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 15 and 16.

- 16. As per claims 33 and 34, the limitations of these claims are covered by the invention disclosed by Sit and the obvious enhancements as discussed in the prior art rejections of claims 1-7, 15 and 16. Therefore, claims 33 and 34 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sit for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 1-7, 15 and 16.
- 17. Claims 8, 9, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sit in view of Gupta et al. USPN 6,917,965 (hereinafter Gupta).
- 18. As per claims 8 and 9, the rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sit is incorporated herein. Sit does not disclose the step (b) further includes the step of: after the peer server registers with the proxy server, notifying a user of the computer via e-mail that content exists on the peer server for viewing, and including a URL of the peer server in the e-mail; wherein step (b) further includes the step of: in response to the user clicking on the URL e-mail, the computer contacts the DNS server to determine an identity of the proxy server in which to send the HTTP request. Gupta discloses means for presenting multimedia to users and presenting annotations to the multimedia, whereby users are notified by email of new annotations, whereby the emails notifying users of new annotations include a URL of the media content. Col. 15:66-16:6. Such a feature provides a useful tool to notify users of new content. Col. 2:5-21. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the method of Sit to further include the step of: after

Art Unit: 2132

the peer server registers with the proxy server, notifying a user of the computer via email that content exists on the peer server for viewing, and including a URL of the peer server in the e-mail; wherein step (b) further includes the step of: in response to the user clicking on the URL e-mail, the computer contacts the DNS server to determine an identity of the proxy server in which to send the HTTP request (DNS is contacted to resolve the URL to an IP address). One would be motivated to do so to provide a useful tool to notify users of new content as taught by Gupta, ibid. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 8 and 9.

19. As per claims 24 and 25, they are claims corresponding to claims 8 and 9, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 8 and 9. Therefore, claims 24 and 25 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sit in view of Gupta for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 8 and 9.

Allowable Subject Matter

20. Claims 10-14 and 26-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2132

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Communications Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUNG KIM whose telephone number is (571)272-3804. The examiner can normally be reached on FLEX.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jung Kim/ Examiner, Art Unit 2132

/Gilberto Barron Jr/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2132